

177 have brought to their customs rather than truly adhere to them. This
183 passive attitude is due to an inveterate fatalism which makes them
563 bow before the undisputed master, the Mututsi, and also to the
antiquity of custom which makes it as respectable as an almost divine
institution.

671 As is the case in the Belgian Congo and generally in [5] Black
Africa, the common law contains not only juridical rules applicable
to persons, property, and society, it also contains religious and magic
regulations, various recipes, etc. Such as it is, it forms a disparate
yet solid whole which gives the solution to problems arising from the
individual and collective life of the Banyarwanda.

671 The common law of Ruanda, applicable to a homogeneous
184 population, is the same everywhere, except in the north on the
563 frontier of Kivu and Uganda, where the authority of the Batutsi over
the Bahutu could not assert itself as in the rest of the country. This
independence has resulted in the substitution of the administration
of the Bahutu clan and family chiefs for that of the Hamite officials.

114 Those who have known Ruanda and its people best are the
members of the Society of Missionary Fathers of Africa. The Reverend
Fathers Lupias, Schumacher, Arnoux, Pages, and Hurel have pub-
lished, in the Anthropos and Congo reviews (among others) and in
numerous monographs, elaborate studies on different aspects of the
social, political, religious, and intellectual life of the Banyarwanda.
The territorial governors Lenaerts and Sandrart have also brought fruit-
ful contributions to the knowledge of Ruanda common law.

121 Nevertheless, we do not believe that a more or less complete
account of the customs of private and public law of Ruanda has ever
been prepared. This is what we have modestly attempted to do in the
• [125] present work by inserting observations gathered in a questionnaire set
up especially to facilitate [6] the study of native law (1). We have

1. J. Vanhove, Questionnaire de Sociologie
juridique, Brussels, printer Lesigne, 1939.

not been able to go into the details of all the institutions of which some,
particularly those relative to cattle contracts, would alone require a
whole volume.

124 But, in spite of the limited time we could devote to this ac-
count of the customs, we believe we have given the essential points

THE PREMISE OF INEQUALITY IN RUANDA

114 for two years, from December 1949 to November 1951. During that period information was secured by continuous observation and by informal interviews with Africans and Europeans. Some administrative officers and missionaries, keenly interested in the society and culture of the Ruanda, have contributed much information and stimulating opinions.

[121] In addition to this work, three systematic inquiries on specific subjects have been completed: political organization, kinship and family structures, and cosmological and ethical systems. Each of these inquiries was prepared by a preliminary survey on the subject, on the basis of which schedules of topics and specific questions were framed.

125
114 The preliminary survey of political organization enabled me to collect a considerable amount of information on that subject. Consequently, a later inquiry could aim primarily at checking and making more precise what was already known. To achieve this purpose a hundred-question schedule was devised. It was the object of each question that it should fulfil as adequately as possible the following conditions: to be neutral (formulated in such a way as not to suggest that the investigator preferred one answer rather than another), significant (likely to clarify obscure or controversial issues), concrete (such as 'Were there more or less people in group A than in group B?') rather than abstract (such as 'Give a definition of the administrative organization'), and simple (to be answered by 'yes', 'no', or one word). This last requirement was particularly important as it made possible a summing up of the answers. A translation of this questionnaire is given as Appendix One.

124 The choice of informants was made according to the following procedure. About a dozen persons, Africans and Europeans, who had been living for many years in Ruanda and had been in close contact with many members of the African community, were asked to give a list of Ruanda (Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa) who, in their opinion, would be familiar with the pre-European political structure, particularly from direct experience. The importance of listing people living in all the different regions of the country was stressed. By collating the various lists I finally obtained a set of about 350 names of men scattered everywhere in the country.

In order to interview them, I had to move between seventy-four different places which were about evenly distributed through the

POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

101

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

(a) Districts, hills; and neighbourhoods

From the point of view of territorial administration, the border zones were distinguished from the rest of the country. Border zones which were permanently threatened by foreign attack were administered by the chief of the army, the headquarters, and camp of which situated in the region. The centre of Ruanda and the regions which were close to a foreign territory not regarded as dangerous were divided into what we shall call administrative districts. There is an almost complete unanimity of informants (97 per cent.) on this.¹¹

Unfortunately, there is confusion about the names applied to these areas. Five names were given by informants, with the following percentages: *igikingi* (3 per cent.); *igiti* (19 per cent.), *urugo* (12 per cent.); *umurwa* (7 per cent.); *ubukebe* (24 per cent.). Moreover, the three terms *igikingi*, *igiti*, *urugo* were all used, according to 2 per cent.; *igiti* and *urugo* according to 4 per cent.; *igikingi* and *igiti* according to 6 per cent.; *igiti* and *ubukebe* according to 8 per cent.; *igikingi*, *igiti*, and *ubukebe* according to 1 per cent. Finally, to add to the confusion, the same word was used to mean different but related units. For instance *igikingi* could mean a sub-division of a hill—according to 97 per cent.—and a hill was itself part of a district to which, as we have just indicated, 12 per cent. applied the term *igikingi*.

At all events the whole country was divided into administrative locations that may be designated as districts. Each of them was ruled by two chiefs, neither of them dependent on the other. Their authority extended over the same territory but from different points of view. The land-chief (*umunyabutaka*) took care of the dues from agriculture and the cattle-chief (*umunyamukensho*) of the dues from stock. According to 60 per cent. of our informants, the same person could not have the two charges. It was possible, however, according to 36 per cent. of the Tutsi asked. But the usual situation was to have two chiefs and not a single one.

The district was divided into hills (*umusozi*). At that level the

¹¹ As has been explained in the introduction, a hundred questions on the political organisation have been put to three hundred informants chosen from all the regions of Ruanda (the interviews took place in seventy-four different places). The percentages to be found in that chapter refer to this sample. When the percentages included decimal fractions, the figures have been brought to the nearest unit.

[P 173]

APPENDIX 1

Translation from Ruanda of the questionnaire on political organization. 125

1. (a) Name of informant.
(b) Son of
(c) Is he a Tutsi, a Hutu, a Twa?
(d) What is or was his occupation, office, title?¹
(e) What is your 'territoire' (Belgian administrative division)?
(f) What is your 'chefferie' (*igihugu*)?
(g) What is your 'sous-chefferie' (*umosozi*)?
(h) Give the name of your patrilineage (*umulyango*).
(i) Give the name of your clan (*ubwoko*).
2. Give the name of your patrilineage head.
3. Where are people more numerous, in the *insu* or in the *umulyango*?
4. Were all the members of your *umulyango* under the command of a single army-chief or were you scattered in different armies?
5. Give the name of the chronologically first army to which your *insu* was affiliated.
6. Has your *insu* been affiliated to armies other than the first one?
7. Have you been trained as an *intore*?
8. Was every Ruanda (whether Tutsi, Hutu or Twa) a member of an army?
9. Was a man ever under the command of two army-chiefs?
10. When an army-chief wanted to recruit *intore* or to require services, could he request it from any individual directly or had he to ask the patrilineage head?
11. Could a young man be incorporated into two *intore* companies?
12. Do you know anybody who has been in that situation? Give his name.
13. When somebody was a member of an army, was he usually the only person of his kin group in that army?
14. Or was he with his married sons?
15. With his unmarried sons?
16. With his brothers?
17. With his brothers' children?
18. With his sisters' children?
19. With his paternal uncles?
20. With his clients?
21. Was it possible for somebody who had never received any cows from a lord to have cows that belonged to him and did not depend on any lord?
22. Were the cows acquired by somebody's independent economic activity regarded as army cows?

¹ The preceding questions were usually answered by the investigator, not directly by the informant. To the following the informant's reply was recorded.

174 THE PREMISE OF INEQUALITY IN RUANDA

- 125 23. Was a married man who was left without any living member of his *insu*, regarded as an *insu* head and had he the same obligation towards his army-chief?
24. Was it the same or was it different to be a client and to be commanded by an army-chief?
25. Were the cows called 'cows of the king' received from a lord?
26. Could all the members of an army be required to perform services concerning cows and war or were they divided into two groups, one of warriors and one of herdsmen?
27. When a new army-chief was appointed, had all the army members the obligation of numbering the cows (*murundo*) and of giving him a cow as recognition of his authority (*indabukirano*)?
28. Was the army member who had no cows obliged to give another recognition gift?
29. Had the army-chief an effective disposal of the cows taken by him during the *murundo*?
30. Could the army-chief order the numbering by himself?
31. Who minded the cows taken during the numbering?
32. When two Tutsi members of the same army and living on the same hill had a dispute about cattle, who had to judge the case?
33. If the two Tutsi were members of different armies, who had to judge the case?
34. When a client wanted to complain about his lord, to whom did he bring the case?
35. When a lord wanted to complain about his client, to whom did he bring the case?
36. When somebody wanted his litigation to be judged by the king, by whom was it advisable to be accompanied?
37. Could anybody, whether Tutsi, Hutu or Twa, appeal to the king if he did not want to accept the previous judgement of another authority?
38. If somebody wanted to appeal to the king and was prevented from doing so by some pressure, what happened if the king knew of it?
39. Could army members who were dissatisfied with their chief do anything to have him dismissed?
40. If it was possible, what did they do?
41. What section of the army had to give to the court the cows supplying fresh milk (*inkube*)?
42. The service of jugs of milk (*igicuba*)?
43. The foodstuffs (*amakoro*)?
44. The bulls to be slaughtered (*indwanyi*)?
45. The steers for divination purposes (*amamana*)?
46. The service of the maintenance of the enclosure?
47. Were all these services and dues given by the patrilineage head or severally by every member of the army?
48. Did the king command the whole country directly or was it divided into several districts?

APPENDIX ONE

175

49. What was the name of these districts?
50. What was the name of the royal residence of the place where you lived? 105
51. Do you remember the names of other royal residences or districts?
52. What is the meaning of *umunyamukenke*?
53. What is the meaning of *umynyabutaka*?
54. Who collected the sorghum tribute (*urutele*) for the court?
55. In addition to the jugs of milk and other *inkuke* sent by the royal residences to the court, were there other jugs of milk and other *inkuke* requested by the tax collectors and sent to the residence?
56. Who required these additional jugs of milk from the hill chief?
57. Which cattle provided the milk?
58. What is the meaning of the word *abakoni*?
59. For the benefit of whom were the cattle seized during military expeditions?
60. What is the meaning of the word *umudende*?
61. Could you give the names of five persons who had *umudende*?
62. What is the meaning of the word *impotore*?
63. Could you give the name of five persons who had *impotore*?
64. What is the meaning of the words *gucana uruti*?
65. Could you give the name of five persons for whom the *gucana uruti* ritual has been performed?
66. Who granted the *umudende* badge?
67. Who granted the *impotore* badge?
68. Who performed the ritual of *gucana uruti*?
69. Did the army cattle include only *nyambo*?
70. Were the army-chief's herds regarded as army cattle?
71. Were the cows given as rewards to the warriors for bravery regarded as army cattle?
72. Were the cows received as bride-wealth regarded as army cattle?
73. Were the cows given to an army member regarded as army cows?
74. Were the cows received by exchange by army members regarded as army cattle?
75. Who granted the hill-chief his office?
76. Who was the superior of the hill-chief?
77. What was the difference between *ibikingi* and *umusozi*?
78. Was any *ibikingi* depending directly on the royal court?
79. Who appointed the heads of these royal *ibikingi*?
80. Had the cattle-chief authority over them?
81. Could the land-chief require tribute labour from the people living on these royal *ibikingi*?
82. Were those who had received these *ibikingi* from the king under the authority of the army-chief?
83. Was the cattle-chief allowed to retain a part of the milk he sent to the court?
84. Was the hill-chief allowed to retain a part of the milk he sent to the cattle-chief?

176 THE PREMISE OF INEQUALITY IN RUANDA

125

85. Was the land-chief allowed to retain a part of the foodstuffs he sent to the court?
86. Was the hill-chief allowed to retain a part of the foodstuffs he sent to the land-chief?
87. Give the name, if you can remember it, of a hill on which there was a royal cemetery.
88. Were the people living on such hills obliged to pay taxes (in agricultural produce) to the court?
89. Do you remember the name of a place under the authority of a *mwiru*?
90. Was such a place submitted to the authority of the cattle- and the land-chiefs?
91. Was it possible for the same person to be at the same time land-chief and cattle-chief?
92. Was the office of the cattle-chief granted only to Tutsi or to Hutu as well?
93. Was the office of land-chief granted only to Tutsi or to Hutu as well?
94. Give the names of Hutu you know, who have been land-chiefs or cattle-chiefs.
95. Give the names of Hutu who have been hill-chiefs.
96. Give the names of Hutu who have been army-chiefs.
97. Could a Twa be appointed hill-chief?
98. Give the names of Twa who have been hill-chiefs.
99. Without being ennobled, could a Twa be appointed cattle-chief or land-chief?
100. When a Twa or Hutu was appointed chief, did the Tutsi living under his authority have to obey him?

[P. 197]

APPENDIX 2

Computation of answers given to the Questionnaire by a sample of
300 Tutsi.

		Absolute figures	Per- centages
1. Is there a difference between <i>yes</i> <i>umulyango</i> and <i>uwoko</i> ? <i>no</i>		274 26	91.3 8.6
2. Do they know the name of <i>yes</i> their <i>umulyango</i> head? <i>no</i>		278 22	92.6 7.3
3. Is there a difference between <i>yes</i> <i>inzu</i> and <i>umulyango</i> ? <i>no</i>		295 5	98.3 1.6
4. Was your family under the <i>one</i> authority of one or several <i>several</i> army-chiefs?		248 52	82.6 17.3
5. Do they know the name of the <i>yes</i> first army to which their <i>inzu</i> <i>no</i> belonged?		295 5	98.3 1.6
6. Has your <i>inzu</i> belonged to <i>yes</i> other armies? <i>no</i>		90 210	30.0 70.0
7. Have you been <i>intore</i> ? <i>yes</i> <i>no</i>		187 113	62.3 37.6
8. Was any Ruanda a member of <i>yes</i> an army? <i>no</i>		298 2	99.3 0.6
9. Was it possible to be a mem- <i>yes</i> ber of two armies? <i>no</i>		1 299	0.3 99.6
10. Could the army-chief require <i>direct</i> dues directly from anybody or <i>lineage head</i> only through the lineage head?		0 300	0.0 100.0
11. Could a man be incorporated <i>yes</i> into two <i>intore</i> companies? <i>no</i>		13 287	4.3 95.6
12. Do they give the name of <i>yes</i> somebody who has been in <i>no</i> such a situation?		13 287	4.3 95.6
13. Was an army member usually <i>yes</i> the only person of his kin <i>no</i> group in the army?		0 300	0.0 100.0
14. Or was he with his married <i>yes</i> sons? <i>no</i>		300 0	100.0 0.0
15. With his unmarried sons? <i>yes</i> <i>no</i>		300 0	100.0 0.0
16. With his brothers? <i>yes</i> <i>no</i>		300 0	100.0 0.0
17. With his brothers' children? <i>yes</i> <i>no</i>		300 0	100.0 0.0

128
125

178 THE PREMISE OF INEQUALITY IN RUANDA

		Absolute figures	Per- centages
128 18. With his sisters' children?	yes	5	1.6
	no	295	98.3
125 19. With his paternal uncles?	yes	300	100.0
	no	0	0.0
20. With his clients?	yes	22	7.3
	no	277	92.3
	DK ¹	1	0.3
21. Was it possible to have cows not granted by a lord?	yes	277	92.3
	no	17	5.6
	DK	6	2.0
22. Were the cows acquired by independent economic activity regarded as army cows?	yes	256	85.3
	no	42	14.0
	DK	2	0.6
23. Was a married man, the only member left of his <i>inzu</i> , re- garded as a lineage head from the army point of view?	yes	293	97.6
	no	0	0.0
	DK	7	2.3
24. Was it the same to be a client and to be commanded by an army-chief?	yes	3	1.0
	no	297	99.0
25. Were the 'king's cows' <i>imbata</i> ?	yes	185	61.6
	no	4	1.3
	DK	111	37.0
26. Did they distinguish in any army two sections (warriors and herdsmen)?	yes	251	83.6
	no	1	0.3
	DK	48	16.0
27. When a new army-chief was appointed, were <i>murundo</i> and/ or <i>indabukirano</i> obligatory?	<i>mur.</i> only	0	0.0
	<i>ind.</i> only	10	3.3
	both	288	96.0
	DK	2	0.6
28. If one had no cows, was one obliged to give a recognition gift?	yes	24	8.0
	no	275	91.6
	DK	1	0.3
29. Had the army-chief the effec- tive disposal of the <i>murundo</i> cows?	yes	300	100.0
	no	0	0.0
30. Could the army-chief order the numbering by himself?	yes	14	4.6
	no	269	89.6
	DK	17	5.6

¹ The symbol DK denotes not only the avowed ignorance of the informants. It has been used also when an answer had to be discarded for other reasons such as its irrelevance indicating that the informant did not understand it, or when it appeared clearly in the interview that the informant was giving any answer for answer's sake, or was answering what he thought the anthropologist wanted.

APPENDIX TWO

179

		Absolute figures	Per- centages
31. Who minded the cattle taken in the <i>merende</i> ?	<i>abakumbi</i> only	106	35.3
	<i>ishomamas</i> only	0	0.0
	both	158	52.6
	a warrior	1	0.3
	DK	35	11.6
32. A dispute between two Tutsi of the same army and the same hill was judged by:	their army-chief	274	91.3
	their land-chief	6	2.0
	DK	20	6.6
33. A dispute between two Tutsi from different armies was judged by:	one army-chief	19	6.3
	both army-chiefs	245	81.6
	their land-chiefs	7	2.3
	DK	29	9.6
34. With whom had a client to lodge a complaint against his lord?	client's army-chief	158	52.6
	lord's army-chief	20	6.6
	king	34	11.3
	DK	88	29.3
35. With whom had a lord to lodge a complaint against his client?	client's army-chief	39	13.0
	lord's army-chief	159	53.0
	land-chief of both	1	0.3
	king	28	9.3
	DK	73	24.3
36. If one wanted one's litigation to be judged by the king, it was advisable to be accompanied by:	one's lord	117	39.0
	one's army-chief	82	27.3
	both of them	54	18.0
	DK	47	15.6
37. Could everybody appeal to the king?	yes	266	88.6
	no	26	8.6
	DK	8	2.6
38. Were those who prevented somebody from appealing to the king punished?	yes	149	49.6
	no	82	27.3
	DK	69	23.0
39. Could army members have their army-chief dismissed?	yes	248	82.6
	no	44	14.6
	DK	8	2.6
40. Who brought the case to the <i>mwami</i> ?	all army mem.	5	1.6
	a delegation	215	71.6
	DK	80	26.6
41. What section of the army had to provide the court with <i>ishukwi</i> ?	<i>abakumbi</i>	295	98.3
	warriors	1	0.3
	DK	4	1.3

128
125

180 THE PREMISE OF INEQUALITY IN RUANDA

		Absolute figures	Per- centages
128 42. What section of the army had 125 to provide the court with jugs of milk?	abashumba	296	98.6
	warriors	0	0.0
	DK	4	1.3
43. With foodstuffs?	abashumba	3	1.0
	warriors	11	3.6
	Hutu army mem.	277	92.3
	DK	9	3.0
44. With bulls to be slaughtered?	abashumba	268	89.3
	warriors	2	0.6
	both sections	8	2.6
	DK	22	7.3
45. With steers for divination purposes?	abashumba	123	41.0
	warriors	2	2.6
	both sections	166	55.3
	DK	9	3.0
46. What section of the army had to maintain the enclosure?	abashumba	11	3.6
	warriors	2	0.6
	Hutu army mem.	4	1.3
	all army mem.	278	92.6
	DK	5	1.6
47. All these services and dues were given by:	lineage head	294	98.0
	each member	2	0.6
	DK	4	1.3
48. Was the country divided into several districts?	yes	290	96.6
	no	7	2.3
	DK	3	1.0
49. What were the names of these districts?	igikingi	10	3.3
	igiti	58	19.3
	urugo	36	12.0
	umwiza	22	7.3
	ubukebe	72	24.0
	igikingi,		
	igiti, rugo	5	1.6
	igiti, rugo	11	3.6
	igikingi, igiti	17	5.6
	igiti, ubukebe	23	8.3
	igikingi,		
	igiti, ubukebe	3	1.0
	DK	41	13.6
50. Do they know the name of the royal residence in the place where they lived?	yes	258	86.0
	no	28	9.3
	DK	14	4.6

APPENDIX TWO

181

		Absolute figures	Per- centages	
51. Do they remember the names of other such residences?	yes	283	94.3	128 125
	no	16	5.3	
	DK	1	0.3	
52. Do they understand <i>umwiyam- utake</i> in the sense of cattle- chief?	yes	277	92.3	
	no	7	2.6	
	DK	16	5.3	
53. Do they understand <i>umwiyab- utake</i> in the sense of land- chief?	yes	283	94.3	
	no	6	2.0	
	DK	11	3.6	
54. Who collected the <i>urute</i> for the court?	land-chief	267	89.0	
	army-chief	11	3.6	
	both of them	3	1.0	
	another person	6	2.0	
	DK	13	4.3	
55. In addition to milk and <i>utake</i> , which other cattle dues were sent to the residence?	milk only	0	0.0	
	<i>utake</i> only	30	10.0	
	both	233	77.3	
	neither of them	32	10.6	
	DK	5	1.6	
56. Who required these additional jugs of milk from the hill- chief?	cattle-chief	204	68.0	
	another person	70	23.3	
	DK	26	8.6	
57. Which cows provided that milk?	indep. acquired	1	0.3	
	<i>abashumba's</i> cows	247	82.3	
	others' cows	33	11.0	
	DK	19	6.3	
58. Do they understand <i>abakowi</i> in the sense of those who seized cattle in expeditions?	yes	203	67.6	
	another meaning	49	16.3	
	DK	48	16.0	
59. For whose benefit were the cattle seized by <i>abakowi</i> ?	army-chief	6	2.0	
	<i>mwami</i>	261	87.0	
	DK	33	11.0	
60. <i>Umwadende</i> means:				
badge for having killed 7 men		206	68.6	
badge		74	24.6	
something else or DK		30	6.6	
61. How many names do they re- member of warriors having worn <i>umwadende</i> ?	five or more	114	38.0	
	less than 5	140	46.0	
	none	46	15.3	
62. <i>Impetere</i> means:				
badge for having killed 14 men		42	14.0	
badge		133	44.3	
something else or DK		125	41.6	

		Absolute figures	Per- centages	
63.	How many names do they remember of warriors having worn <i>impotors</i> ?	five or more less than five none	12 78 210	4.0 26.0 70.0
64.	<i>Gucana uruti</i> means: ritual after having killed 21 men a military honour something else or DK		32 213 55	10.6 71.0 18.3
65.	How many names do they remember of warriors having received that honour?	five or more less than five none	5 108 187	1.6 36.0 62.3
66.	Who granted the <i>umudende</i> badge?	oneself army-chief king DK	16 2 245 37	5.3 0.6 81.6 12.6
67.	Who granted the <i>impotors</i> badge?	oneself king DK	5 164 131	1.6 54.6 43.6
68.	Who performed the ritual of <i>gucana uruti</i> ?	oneself army-chief lord king DK	146 1 2 89 62	48.6 0.3 0.6 29.6 20.6
69.	Did the cattle army include only <i>nyambo</i> ?	yes no DK	23 267 10	7.6 89.0 3.3
70.	Did the army cattle include the army-chief's herds?	yes no DK	287 3 10	95.6 1.0 3.3
71.	Did the army cattle include the cows given to the army warriors as rewards for bravery?	yes no DK	284 5 10	94.6 1.6 3.3
72.	Did the army cattle include the cows received as bride-wealth by army members?	yes no DK	286 4 10	95.3 1.3 3.3
73.	Did the army cattle include the cows received as gifts by the army members?	yes no DK	287 3 10	95.6 1.0 3.3
74.	Did the army cattle include the cows received in exchange with the army members?	yes no DK	286 4 10	95.3 1.3 3.3

APPENDIX TWO

183

		Absolute figures	Per- centages
75. The hill-chief received his office from:	land-chief	5	1.6
	cattle-chief	8	2.6
	army-chief	26	8.6
	king	97	32.3
	cattle-chief, army-chief	17	5.6
	land-, army-c., king	1	0.3
	army-c., king	68	22.6
	cattle-c., army-c., king	21	7.0
	land-c., king	1	0.3
	cattle-c., king	9	3.0
	DK	47	15.6
76. The superior of the hill-chief was:	land-chief	7	2.3
	cattle-chief	30	10.0
	army-chief	77	25.6
	lord	1	0.3
	another person	63	21.0
	cattle-c., army-c.	38	12.6
	cattle-c., king	2	0.6
	army-c., king	7	2.3
	DK	75	25.0
77. The area of the <i>sumuosi</i> , when compared to that of the <i>shikingsi</i> was:	larger	290	96.6
	the same	8	2.6
	DK	2	0.6
78. Were there <i>shikingsi</i> depending directly on the royal court?	yes	294	98.0
	no	4	1.3
	DK	2	0.6
79. Who appointed the heads of these <i>shikingsi</i> ?	king	296	98.6
	somebody else	1	0.3
	DK	3	1.0
80. Had the cattle-chief authority over them?	yes	101	33.6
	no	192	64.0
	DK	7	2.3
81. Could the land-chief require labour from those living on these royal <i>shikingsi</i> ?	yes	64	21.3
	no	232	77.3
	DK	4	1.3
82. Were those who had received these <i>shikingsi</i> from the king under the army-chief's authority?	yes	171	57.0
	no	128	42.6
	DK	1	0.3

		<i>Absolute figures</i>	<i>Per- centages</i>
128 83.	Was the cattle-chief allowed to retain a part of the milk he sent to the court?	yes 18 no 273 DK 9	6.0 91.0 3.0
125 84.	Was the hill-chief allowed to retain a part of the milk he sent to the cattle-chief?	yes 16 no 276 DK 8	5.3 92.0 2.6
85.	Was the land-chief allowed to retain a part of the foodstuffs he sent to the court?	yes 296 no 0 DK 4	98.6 0.0 1.3
86.	Was the hill-chief allowed to retain a part of the foodstuffs he sent to the land-chief?	yes 285 no 8 DK 7	95.0 2.6 2.3
87.	Do they know the name of a hill on which there was a royal cemetery?	yes 263 Rutare 214 no 30 DK 7	87.6 71.6 10.0 2.3
88.	Were the people living on such hills obliged to pay agricultural dues to the court?	yes 13 no 251 DK 36	4.3 83.6 12.0
89.	Do they know the name of a <i>mwiru's</i> place?	yes 229 no 55 DK 16	76.3 18.3 5.3
90.	Was such a place submitted to the authority of the cattle- and land-chiefs?	yes 3 no 237 DK 60	1.0 79.0 20.0
91.	Could the same person be at the same time cattle- and land-chief?	yes 107 no 180 DK 13	35.6 60.0 4.3
92.	Could a Hutu be cattle-chief?	yes 18 no 273 DK 9	6.0 91.0 3.0
93.	Could a Hutu be land-chief?	yes 275 no 21 DK 4	91.6 7.0 1.3
94.	Do they know the names of Hutu cattle-chiefs?	yes 14 no 286	4.6 95.3
95.	Do they know the names of Hutu land-chiefs?	yes 258 no 42	86.0 14.0
	Do they know the names of Hutu hill-chiefs?	yes 207 no 83 DK 10	69.0 27.3 3.3

APPENDIX TWO

185

		<i>Absolute figures</i>	<i>Per- centages</i>
96. Do they know the names of Hutu army-chiefs?	yes	167	55.6
	no	130	43.3
	DK	3	1.0
97. Could a Twa be appointed hill-chief?	yes	201	67.0
	no	96	32.0
	DK	3	1.0
98. Do they know the names of Twa who have been hill-chiefs?	yes	195	65.0
	no	101	33.6
	DK	4	1.3
99. Could a Twa be appointed cattle-chief or land-chief without being ennobled?	yes	0	0.0
	no	297	99.0
	DK	3	1.0
100. When Tutsi lived under the authority of a Twa or Hutu chief, did they have to obey him?	yes	284	94.6
	no	7	2.3
	DK	9	3.0

128
125